Responses to the PCC Survey on the use of *Cataloger's Desktop* and preferences for PCC Documentation Delivery

Introduction and background information on original survey:

Dear NACO Contact:

This survey will assist in the planning for resource expenditures by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) and LC's Cataloging Distribution Services (CDS). LC, in support of the PCC Programs, makes available at no cost to NACO participants required cataloging documentation (e.g., *MARC 21 Authority Format*; the *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*, and the corresponding updates to these documents) in printed format. Other required Program documentation, the *Descriptive Cataloging Manual ZI* (yellow pages) and the *LC Guideline Supplement to the MARC 21 Authority Format* (blue pages), are available to PCC Participants **only** via .pdf formatted files or through *Catalogers' Desktop.*

The ease of availability and accessibility of required cataloging documentation assures that contributions to the PCC component programs are formulated according to the most current cataloging policies and practices. In examining cost effective and efficient document delivery options for the future, the first step is to identify all current NACO participants that have access to *Cataloger's Desktop* and secondly, what options would be desirable for future document delivery.

Please take the time to read this survey, consult with colleagues, and respond by August 16, 2002; note that responses are not binding. All suggestions will be given serious consideration. Thank you for your support!

For questions about the survey contact: Ana Cristan: acri@loc.gov 202-707-7921

The survey was extended until August 27, 2002.

185 individual surveys were sent to the NACO contacts of each institution.

A total of 106 responses were received.

Questions on survey with tabulated responses and summarized comments:

Q1. Check all PCC Programs in which your institution currently participates:

BIBCO **36 responses**

CONSER **28 responses**

NACO **106 responses**

SACO **44 responses**

Q2. Does your institution currently subscribe to *Cataloger's Desktop*?

Yes **80**
No **26**

Comments:

Yes: CD-ROM users are very happy; it is user-friendly, especially the links between AACR, LCRI, NACO manual, MARC, etc., and the keyword searching facility. Those using Cataloger's Desktop via a network environment report technical difficulties in setting it up in a shared environment and in updating, with corresponding loss of functionality such as copy and paste. Most difficulties can be smoothed out with sufficient in-house work. Some users stated a preference for a web-based version.

No: Too expensive and too difficult to work properly as a networked tool.

Q3. Do NACO catalogers at your institution have access to *Cataloger's Desktop*?

Yes 79
No 27

Comments

Yes: Most have it available at least in the larger cataloging units of their institutions. Some have problems with reliability of access and with receiving/implementing updates. Some miss not having the ability to make notes.

No: We've had difficulty getting Cataloger's Desktop to work properly as a networked tool. Our systems person is once again exploring the issues and problems with networking.

Q4. Would your institution be willing to use *Cataloger's Desktop* exclusively in lieu of the printed PCC required documentation (i.e., *MARC 21 Authority Format* and *LCRI* s)?

Yes 45
No 61

Comments

Yes: Qualified yes in most cases. It depends upon ease of installation/update and reliable access in a networked environment and, most importantly, upon cost. Some institutions suggested a discount for NACO members.

No: There will always be a need for a printed back-up during down times and in a classroom or meeting environment. Researching an issue from more than one document is easier with paper copies. Too expensive and elaborate for our needs. It's currently not robust enough to depend upon wholly. We prefer web-based versions of software so we don't have to do local support. If the choice is between the proprietary Desktop and a printed version of documentation, I am uncomfortable with that.

Q5. If you responded **yes** to Question 4, would catalogers at your institution need training in the use of *Cataloger's Desktop*?

Yes 18
No 27

Comments:

No comments received

Q6. If you responded **no** to Question 4, would your institution be willing to make paper copies of the base volume and/or the subsequent updates of the *MARC 21 Authority Format* and the *LCRI*s from .pdf formatted files?

Yes, our institution can make copies of the base volume and all updates from .pdf files in order to have printed documentation. **38**

No, our institution would prefer to receive printed documentation and updates from CDS and would pay for the subscription costs, if necessary. **23**

Comments:

No comments received

Q7. Suggestions for future document delivery options.

PDF, web-based delivery, and Cataloger's Desktop (in that order) were the preferred means of document delivery among respondents. Timeliness of updates and delivery, and cost were the major concerns.